

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-10, and 13 are currently pending in this application. By this response to the non-final Office Action dated October 26, 2010, independent claims 1, 10, and 13 are amended. Support for the amendments is found, for example, at page 26, lines 18 to page 27, line 16 of the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced. Favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the foregoing amendments and following comments is respectfully solicited.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to unpatentable subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggested amending claim 13 to recite a “non-transitory computer-readable recording medium.” Applicants have adopted the Examiner’s suggestion. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under Section 101.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103(a)

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 8-10, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,509,974 (Hansen). On page 8 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

the rules stored in the rule storage unit include a rule executed when output is to paper, a rule executed when page size and paper size are designated as

the output requirement, a rule executed when a trap is set as the output requirement, and a rule executed when a special color is set as the output requirement.

Amended independent claims 10 and 13 each recite, *inter alia*,

the rules include a rule executed when output is to paper, a rule executed when page size and paper size are designated as the output requirement, a rule executed when a trap is set as the output requirement, and a rule executed when a special color is set as the output requirement.

According to the claimed subject matter, a workflow is created based on the above rules.

Page 5, lines 6-13 of the Office Action concluded that Hansen discloses a “rule storage unit” as previously presented in independent claim 1. However, although Hansen teaches that the resource allocator can include “policies” or predefined rules for handling particular capability “requests,” Hansen does not teach creating a workflow (a job ticket) based on the policies or rules which are set in the resource allocator.

Hansen teaches that tools are provided by the workflow management software to support electronic versions of tickets for specifying production output device instructions and parameters, as well as other finishing steps, which are global to the document. Moreover, Hansen teaches that a ticket can be associated with a document by selecting the ticket and that, once associated, the options set by the ticket will apply to the associated document. However, merely associating a document with a ticket independent of the document is already discussed at page 1, line 24 to page 2, line 12 of the specification as originally filed as a conventional technique distinguished from the claimed subject matter. As for associations of documents with tickets shown in Hansen, FIG. 4, a ticket can be associated with a document by selecting the ticket and dragging and dropping the ticket on a particular document, and the association is visually displayed by showing the ticket under the hierarchy of the document. Thus, Hansen is distinguished from the claimed subject matter, as attributes of the image recording media

constituting finally resulting matter are not displayed and a workflow is not created based on such attributes.

As Hansen does not disclose or render obvious at least the above limitations, it does not anticipate or demonstrate obviousness of claim 1. For much the same reasons, claims 10 and 13 are likewise not anticipated by, or obvious in view of, Hansen. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of independent claims 1, 10, and 13, and the remainder of the pending claims, which depend thereon.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request the Examiner's favorable reconsideration as to allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' representative listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Eric M. Shelton

Registration No. 57,630

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 EMS:MWE
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: January 26, 2011

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**